place through footnotes, but by subsuming the critical conversations, the potential stakes of Lynch’s own argument are sometimes also subsumed. Chapter 5, for instance, offers a nuanced reading of Dalila in light of Shakespeare’s Cleopatra. Doing so certainly furthers Lynch’s argument about the realization of an Arendtian public sphere in a Christian theology, but it’s not clear how that argument might address current pressing questions about *Samson Agonistes*, such as questions of the poem’s attitude toward women or toward non-Christian traditions and peoples. Lynch is under no responsibility for her book to address this or any other critical question, of course (though the preface does situate it as “broadly ‘regenerationist’” (xvi)), but those whose first interest is Milton might have to sort out the applications of this book towards any particular question themselves. (This is not to say Lynch does not document these questions in her notes, but only that she does not in general engage them, as her argument is elsewhere.) The same observation might be extended to Lynch’s discussions of Arendt, the classical and early modern public sphere, and early modern rhetoric; all of these topics are brought together in a thought-provoking argument, but a specialist in any one of these areas might have to find their own ways to apply that argument. They also might not always find Lynch’s methods compelling. For example, her claims about classical rhetoric rely primarily on Arendt and secondary sources, while her claims about Renaissance rhetoric rest largely on English, rather than Latin, rhetorical texts; these approaches could detract from her connection of the classical and Renaissance traditions. Nevertheless, Lynch offers a vision of rich complexity in which both the nature of the early modern public sphere and Milton’s relationship to the classical world and his own can be seen in a new way.


Reuben Sánchez’s *Typology and Iconography in Donne, Herbert, and Milton* starts with an ambitious goal: to demonstrate how the
figure of Jeremiah acts both as a type and icon for the authors in the book’s title. Moreover, this goal is complicated by Sánchez’s desire to demonstrate how the biblical Jeremiah and the iconography inspired by him during the Middle Ages and Renaissance ultimately lead one to see him in four different modes: prophet, parson, minister, and revolutionary. Sánchez believes that these four modes are best seen in the art of Rembrandt, Sluter, and Michelangelo and best expressed through the literature of Donne (poet-prophet), Herbert (poet-parson), and Milton (poet-minister and poet-revolutionary), respectively. As he puts it, “I wish to show how and why Donne, Herbert, and Milton each conveys his own vision as prophet—but specifically how each fashions himself after the prophet Jeremiah” (16).

In Chapter Two, Sánchez begins his excursion into Donne-as-poet-prophet by suggesting that the spirit of Rembrandt’s The Prophet Jeremiah Lamenting the Destruction of Jerusalem “inspires and characterizes Donne’s self-fashioning as prophet at about the time he enters the ministry” (28), even though, as he confesses, Donne would never live to see Rembrandt’s piece. To achieve this end, Sánchez first closely analyzes and interprets Rembrandt’s oil-on-panel painting as iconography. His analysis of the painting points to Rembrandt capturing Jeremiah at a unique moment not captured by most of the iconography surrounding the prophet, for Rembrandt’s Jeremiah “conveys despair and hope” and this, Sánchez suggests, is the image “most attractive to Donne at around the time of his ordination in the Church of England: The pose of utter sadness and despair, the inability to console others as well as oneself, but the recognition that there is hope, if only one could be turned” (34). Here, then, Sánchez turns to the analysis of Donne’s “Good Friday, 1613. Riding Westward” and The Lamentations of Jeremy, for the Most Part According to Tremelius. As he puts it, “Like the prophet, Donne despairs, again and again; like the prophet, Donne must learn how to turn himself, his readers, and his auditors, again and again, toward God via the poet’s words and the preacher’s sermons” (37). At times, however, this argument gets bogged down by points that seem tangential to the thesis. For example, Sánchez feels compelled to attempt to find a date of composition for both poems—always perilous ground in Donne studies. And even if one were to be entirely convinced by his suggested dates of composition,
he never makes it entirely clear why finding such dates is essential for his readers. To make matters of date and time even fuzzier, Sánchez reads much of George Herbert’s poetry to elucidate Donne’s focus on the concept of turning/conversion. If the point of dating the poems, then, is to demonstrate a trajectory to Donne’s consideration of Jeremiah across his writing career, the odd anachronistic comparisons with Herbert’s poetry further confuse what could quite possibly be achieved in a straightforward manner.

Chapter Three concludes Sánchez’s examination of Donne’s rhetorical ability to help his readers and auditors “turn,” as envisaged through the iconography of Rembrandt’s Jeremiah. As he argues, “Donne accomplishes the turn through consolation, an art he acquires by reading contemporary books on *artes concionandi*, but also by reading The Book of the Prophet Jeremiah and Lamentations. Most importantly, he practices consolation by fashioning the self after Jeremiah” (67). Here, then, Sánchez looks to Donne’s sermon on Lamentations 3.1 and his well-known letter to his mother after the death of his sister, Anne Lyly. I suspect many readers will be disappointed by how little Sánchez truly analyzes the sermon and the letter. The chapter is a swift fifteen pages, and much of that space is consumed with broad discussions of the *artes praedicandi* and *artes concionandi*, as well as numerous references back to the work of Chapter Two.

In Part Two, “Sluter’s Jeremiah: Herbert and Learning How to Visualize the Heart,” Sánchez looks to Claus Sluter’s carving, the “Well of Moses” or the “Moses Fountain,” as it came to be known in the nineteenth century, to establish a corresponding iconography of Jeremiah as a parson in order to delineate Herbert’s vision of the parson. As with Donne’s relationship with Rembrandt, Sánchez is not essentially concerned with establishing whether or not Herbert knew of Sluter’s “Well of Moses.” Rather, he asserts the more general argument that “Sluter composed his Jeremiah from stone, a substance hewn, carved, sculpted, painted, even written upon” and similarly, “*The Temple* is hewn, carved, sculpted, and written upon . . .” (82). For Sánchez, then, Herbert’s access to Sluter is not the point. “The iconography and the typology of *The Temple* rely upon how the poet works the stone and how the reader perceives the stone, literally and metaphorically, and on what the stone represents” (82). But before
the significance of stone is fully analyzed, Sánchez looks at the image of the heart in Ezekiel and Jeremiah: “Ezekiel and Jeremiah, in their uses of the heart as metaphor for rebirth, emphasize the public and the private, hence signaling a shift to individual responsibility as prelude to public liberty. . .” (90). He then suggests that Herbert also finds this shift to be “important and necessary” (90), and by using the metaphor of the heart again and again, Herbert employs a form of “heart-writing”—something akin to Sluter hewing his stone. Chapter Five is steadfastly committed to understanding Herbert’s visualization of the heart (and hearts) in *The Temple*—first through the image of the cleansing of hearts, then the image of the hammered hardened heart, next the image of the healed broken heart, and finally the image of the bleeding heart. Sánchez examines several emblem books here and argues (albeit implicitly) that there is a sort of intertextual relationship between Herbert’s depictions of the heart in his poetry and the emblems present in the work of people like Henry Hawkins, Christopher Harvey, Georgette de Montenay, and Benedict van Haeften, to name a few.

In his third and final part of the book, “Michelangelo’s Jeremiah: Milton and Learning How to Be a Prophet,” Sánchez returns to the notion of “heroic melancholy” that he establishes in his first chapter, suggesting that Michelangelo’s Jeremiah in the Sistine Chapel “is melancholy because he feels he has failed, or, perhaps more to the point, because he feels his nation has failed to listen to him” and that this too is “what we see when we read [Milton’s] *The Readie and Easie Way*” (139, 141) and *Samson Agonistes*. It is in this section of his book where Sánchez risks most, asserting that *The Readie and Easie Way* is not only anti-Ciceronian (as opposed to Ciceronian, as some Miltonists have argued) but also in a “location beyond anti-Ciceronian where witnessing is required to lofty principle but where practical proposals also seem necessary and yet virtually hopeless of adoption, a methodology similar to Jeremiah’s on the eve of the fall of Jerusalem to the Babylonians in 587 BCE” (165). In Chapter Eight, he goes on to explore how Milton is able to fashion “the self after Jeremiah” not only near the end of the revolution, as he does in *The Readie and Easie Way* (1660, second edition), but also near the beginning of the revolution in *The Reason of Church Government* (1642). “In *The Reason
of Church Government,” he writes, “Milton worries the reader might misunderstand the manner in which the prophet expresses himself, if the reader does not recognize the expression as generated in a specific historic and linguistic context” (194). Sánchez sees a younger Milton adopting the pose of the Jeremiah we see in Jeremiah 20, where decorum “determines the text’s prophetic persona” (194). At a certain point, however, decorum is of little concern when one knows, as do Jeremiah and Milton (before the fall of Jerusalem and the return of the Stuart monarchy, respectively), that “few people, if any, listen . . .” (204).

Chapter Nine, “‘Unapocryphall Vision’: Jeremiah as Exemplary Model for Donne, Herbert, and Milton,” serves as Sánchez’s conclusion by quickly providing a narrative synopsis of the entire book. He also provides three appendices on Renaissance angels and other melancholy figures, Renaissance images of Jeremiah, and Renaissance melancholy and modern theory. While Typology and Iconography in Donne, Herbert, and Milton offers a promising thesis and is unique in its interdisciplinary reach, I cannot help but feel that much gets lost in the interdisciplinary shuffle. Apart from his analysis of Milton’s The Readie and Easie Way, Sánchez’s analyses of the literature of Donne and Herbert seem cursory. They lack the depth one would expect to find in a book on such rich authors. The same could be said of his treatment of the iconography of Jeremiah, biblical interpretation, and the history of criticism regarding the art, Bible, and literature he attempts to analyze and bring together. In other words, I find that this book lacks in depth what it offers in breadth, which is disappointing, given that when Sánchez does provide a depth of analysis—as he does with Milton—that analysis proves enlightening.


This essay collection is a welcome addition to Ashgate’s Women and Gender in the Early Modern World series which published its one